

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the specification. Such objections are deemed overcome in view of the clarifications made to the specification hereinabove.

The Examiner has further provisionally rejected Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of Claims 1-22 of copending Application No.: 09/894,164. This rejection is deemed moot, in view of the amendments made hereinabove.

The Examiner has still further rejected Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(g) as claiming the same invention as that of Claims 1-22 of copending Application No.: 09/894,164, and because the Patent Office requires the assignee to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. In response, applicant emphasizes that the present application was filed as a continuation-in-part of copending Application No.: 09/894,164 for the specific purpose of correcting inventorship. Thus, inventorship of the claims at issue is now correctly shown in the present application. In other words, the inventors listed in the present application are correct (i.e. prior, etc.).

The Examiner has provisionally rejected Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by copending Application No.: 09/894,164. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The present application claims priority from Application No.: 09/894,164. Thus, Application No.: 09/894,164 is disqualified as prior art, as to any common subject matter.

The Examiner has still further rejected Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The present application was filed as a continuation-in-part for the specific purpose of correcting inventorship. Thus, inventorship of the claims at issue is now correctly shown in the present application.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 10-14, and 17-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gadbois et al. (US Patent No. 5,903,864). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims. Specifically, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the subject matter of Claim 3, as well as additional limitations believed to be novel when taken in combination with the remaining limitations.

With respect to independent Claims 1, 19, 20, and 23; the Examiner has relied on Gadbois' disclosed, "The list of hypothesized cities 40 and the list of cities 42 are merged 44 to create a city list 45" (Col. 4 lines 37-38) to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "combining each instance of a match of a first one of the components with each instance of a match of a second one of the components to generate a plurality of grammar expressions." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Gadbois' disclosed merged list is comprised of the combination of hypothesized cities that correspond to a recognized zipstate and to other zipstates that the recognizer would likely confuse with the recognized zipstate and valid cities that correspond to the recognized state given by the zipstate utterance. (Col. 4 lines 26-36) Gadbois simply does not even suggest a single utterance that includes at least two components where a match for each of the components are combined to create a plurality of grammar expressions. Again, the Examiner's reliance on Gadbois' merging of hypothesized cities and valid cities into a list does not meet applicant's claimed creation of grammar expressions based on combining matches of individual components contained in an utterance.

Further regarding each of the independent claims, applicant further emphasizes the incorporation of dependant Claim 3 along with additional subject matter believed to be novel. Specifically, applicant has added the following language believed not to be met by the prior art:

“wherein the plurality of grammar expressions include every possible combination of the first and second matches;
wherein a score is assigned to each of the grammar expressions;
wherein the assigned score is comprised of a product of component scores associated with the first and second components.”

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criteria has simply not been met by the Gadbois reference, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings the following subject matter of new Claims 24-27 to the Examiner's attention, for full consideration:

“wherein the cached results expire at the end of a session from which the cached results originated” (see Claim 24);

“wherein each grammar expression is first compared with the cached results” (see Claim 25);

“wherein potential recognition grammars are produced for each of the first and second components” (see Claim 26); and

"wherein the potential recognition grammars of the first and second components are respectively combined in every possible combination" (see Claim 27).

Again, a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

To this end, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable. Moreover, the remaining dependent claims are further deemed allowable, in view of their dependence on such independent claims.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. BVOC022A).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100